DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 366 416 PS 021 834

AUTHOR Thompson, Debra S.
TITLE A Historical Perspective of the Training and Education of Early Childhood Education Teachers.
PUB DATE [92]
NOTE 40p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Historical Materials (060)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Child Caregivers; *Day Care; *Early Childhood Education; Educational Certificates; *Educational History; Government Role; Higher Education; Kindergarten; Postsecondary Education; Preschool Teachers; Teacher Certification; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Qualifications; *Teacher Role; United States History

ABSTRACT

The history of the training and education of early childhood teachers, from the beginnings of their profession in the 19th century to the present, is reflective of the diverse and complex historical, political, and economic forces that have shaped the development of child care in this country. Early training followed an apprenticeship model, but as the number of training schools grew the curriculum became more formal and specialized in the late 19th and early 20th century, with many normal schools and colleges offering such training alone or in conjunction with primary education programs. The economic depression of the 1930s and the Second World War both contributed to increasing the number of women in the work force, and Project Head Start, introduced in the 1960s, led to greater government involvement in and sponsoring of child care and early childhood programs. Education programs for early childhood teachers in recent decades have focused on non-degree certificate programs, two-year associate degrees, or four-year baccalaureate programs for the preparation of teachers and specialists. Certification and credentialling standards vary considerably from state to state, and specific indicators of qualified staff have been hampered by a lack of general agreement on the role of the early childhood teacher, either as custodial care provider or preschool educator. Contains 87 references. (MDM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 366 416

A Historical Perspective of the Training and Education of Early Childhood Education Teachers

Debra S. Thompson, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor and Program Chair
University of Dubuque
2000 University Ave., 203 Smith Hall
Dubuque, IA 52001

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Debra S. Thompson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PS 021834

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction

This paper reviews the historical development of training and education of early childhood teachers, including the areas of teacher education, credentialling and certification, and qualifications and roles as related to training and education. It covers the past history of training and education through to the current day state of affairs in the United States.

A Historical Perspective of the Training and Education of Early Childhood Teachers

"The history of child care in the United States is a history of diverse programs, offered under different auspices, to different populations, for different reasons" (Joffe, 1977, p. 15). The history of the training and education of early childhood teachers is reflective of this diversity: there is a distinct interconnectedness between the history of child care and the history of the training and education of teachers and caregivers of young children. Indeed, complex historical, political, and economic forces have been at work in shaping the development of child care in this country and, thus, the training and education of its personnel.

There exists a diversity of early childhood programs which, in turn, has historically affected the variety of roles and qualifications of teachers and caregivers. Unfortunately, this diversity in the field is aided by the failure to reach a clear

definition of categories or levels of training and education related to the amount as well as content of it.

Historical accounts of the development of training, education, and certification of early childhood teachers do not identify the differences between training and education at the prekindergarten, kindergarten, and elementary levels. In addition, most historical accounts are dominated by descriptions of training, education, and certification at the elementary and kindergarten levels with few descriptions of training at the prekindergarten level. Therefore, this paper will maintain a focus on the training, education, and certification of prekindergarten and kindergarten teachers for early childhood settings during the period when they were historically separate from the formal public school setting. For the most part, this transition of child care from a private, charitable arrangement to a public-sponsored one occurred between the mid 1800s and the early 1900s.

A brief account of the historical development of early childhood programs in the United States will initially provide a focus for understanding why concerns regarding the training and education of teachers is difficult to portray.

The concept of child care extended beyond its European origins rapidly. Initially, the responsibility for raising and educating young children remained with family members. With the onset of the Industrial Revolution, the agrarian way of life dissipated, and the first day nursery was established in 1767 for working parents (Blum, 1983). The notion of providing out of home care for children spread quickly and day nurseries emerged throughout

Europe.

The success of day nurseries for children of poor families paved the way for the first organized kindergarten. Froebel not only had the insight to meet the growing needs of young children whose parents worked in factories, but also provided developmentally appropriate materials for young children (Blum, 1983). The education of young children became "an entity in its own right" (Braun & Edwards, 1972, p. 61).

The concept of day nurseries and kindergartens quickly spread to the United States. The emergence of nursery schools evolved from the accepted growth of prior programs for young children. Early British nursery schools were begun as philanthropic vehicles by affluent women to aid destitute families (Blum, 1983). Originally, nursery schools combined aspects of both day nurseries and kindergartens; the focus was on providing social services for the poor as well as educational development for children of the less needy. By 1825, the first American nursery was began for children over two years of age (Blum, 1983). By 1873, many day nurseries and kindergartens, both private and public, were established in America (Blum, 1983). However, these programs were designed for middle-class children and not for the children of factory laborers, as were their European counterparts.

Three diverse trends became apparent in the establishment of American programs for young children. Each varied acccording to staff, clientele, and purpose. The first, day nurseries, more closely associated with the contemporary day care center, was for children from homes where the mother had to work due to widowhood

or abandonment. Children who came from dual-employed parents were excluded from using such services (Greenman & Fuqua, 1984). Nursery centers fulfilled the primary purpose of providing care to "children who remain(ed) part of a family unit but who, for social or economic reasons, (could not) receive ordinary parental care" (Spodek, 1982a, p. 5).

The roots of the current debate about whether child care should be custodial or educational can also be located in the day nursery tradition. The emphasis of day nurseries became that of providing custodial care, often socializing children - rarely educating them (Greenman & Fuqua, 1984). However, despite popular histories that maintain that all nurseries were custodial in nature (Steinfels, 1973), some actually did provide educational programs for older preschoolers by employing the services of a kindergarten or Montessori teacher for part of the day (Whitebook, 1976).

Other distinctions were found among the day nursery staff. Most nurseries, consequently, were staffed by a matron, a middle class woman who could create the proper atmosphere for her "wayward charges", and by helpers, who were usually untrained young women from the local community (Whitebook, 1984). Characteristically, employees were female, having little or no training, and "inadequate in background...to properly envisage the total needs of [young children]" (Spodek, 1982a, p. 5).

The second type of program for young children, the kindergarten, focused on providing preschool education. Originally intended for middle-class families, American kindergarten programs were more readily used by children of the working classes,

especially in communities with a high proportion of immigrant working mothers (Greenman & Fuqua, 1984). Kindergarten teachers were female with more ability to provide for the social development of young children (Greenman & Fuqua, 1984) as well as instructing them, in order to help them prepare for the coming years of schooling (Braun & Edwards, 1972).

Nursery schools, the third type of early American programs, became associated with collegiate departments of psychology (Greenman & Fuqua, 1984) and teacher training institutions (Blum, 1983) in the 1920s. Aimed for use by middle class clientele, the objective was to provide supplementary care and enrichment during the preschool years (Greenman & Fuqua, 1984) rather than to provide child care. Teachers in nursery schools were professionally trained and many possessed baccalaureate degrees in a variety of areas - "education, psychology, home economics, and[/or] child development" (Greenman & Fuqua, 1984, p. 74).

As kindergarten programs and nursery schools gained greater acceptance among the middle and upper classes, a declining emphasis was placed upon day nurseries or day care centers, as they were commonly called (Spodek, 1982b). As a result, the quality of these programs was considerably reduced. This continued until the Depression, at which time the federal government began to sponsor nurseries.

The passage of the Lanham Act of 1941 marked the beginning of public funding to meet child care expenditures (Sroufe, 1980). Additionally, this legislation recognized that the education of young children was "a public responsibility" (Sroufe, 1980, p.

194).

Under the Lanham Act, federal nurseries were established, primarily as a means of providing job opportunities for unemployed social workers and teachers (Greenman & Fuqua, 1984; Blum, 1983; Spodek, 1982b). The Works Project Administration (WPA) centers were patterned after the nursery school rather than the other prevailing trends such as the day nurseries (Greenman & Fuqua, 1984). There were 2,393 such centers in all parts of the country (Hymes, 1977).

The federal government continued to sponsor nurseries well into World War II. In 1943, "$6,000,000 [was appropriated] for war nursery schools...nurseries [that were] created" (Blum, 1983, p. 103) for the expressed intent of engaging women in the war effort (Greenman & Fuqua, 1984; Blum, 1983; Spodek, 1982b). Approximately 400,000 preschool children were sponsored by the federal government (Scarr & Weinberg, 1986)--not because legislators believed day care was good for children, but because the children's mothers were essential to the war industries. From 1943 to 1954, the Kaiser Child Service Centers, supported by and based in the ship-building industry in Oregon, were exemplary in terms of what nursery school teachers could do in child care (Almy, 1975). Opened 24 hours a day, 364 days a year, the centers at their peak served over a thousand children. Unfortunately, after the war, most of these centers were closed because the federal government suspended its support (Zigler & Gordon, 1982).

As Dowley has noted, the Kaiser experience led to considerable rethinking of nursery school techniques, with a revision of child

care objectives and greater insight into the emotional and social needs of children (Dowley, 1971). According to some critics, a concern for the emotional and social development of children, even to the exclusion of concern for their intellects, permeated nursery education for the next 20 years. Whether this is an accurate view, or whether postwar changes increased the incidence of emotional disturbance among young children, it appears that many experienced nursery school teachers were unprepared for what was called the "rediscovery of early childhood education" in the 1960s, and its heavy emphasis on cognition.

By the end of the 1960s, there was a renewed interest in the education of young children. The 1957 launch of Sputnik initiated education reforms at all levels. A part of the reforms included a new emphasis on educating children at an earlier age (Blum, 1983). Other contributors to this renewed interest were the Civil Rights Movement of the early sixties and the War on Poverty. As a result, federally supported social welfare programs were once again established (Blum, 1983; Robinson, Robinson, Darling, & Holm, 1979). One such program was Project Head Start, created in 1965, as a remediation program for disadvantaged poverty-striken preschool children (Blum, 1983). This program became a landmark in the day care legacy. Unlike the previous federally-sponsored day care programs where the emphasis was placed on providing care to meet <u>adult</u> needs (i.e., employment), Head Start was initiated to meet the needs of <u>children</u> (Sroufe, 1980; Hess & Croft, 1972).

Head Start programs were developed to achieve the maximum benefits of both the nursery school concept and day care programs

(Almy, 1975). Programmatic priorities of Head Start were similar to those found in nursery schools. The educational component was supplemented by a variety of comprehensive care programs, including the custodial intent found in day nurseries (Greenman & Fuqua, 1984). The clientele more closely resembled those attending day nurseries. Staffing Head Start programs was another issue that forged a union between day care and nursery schools. Unlike the well-prepared teachers of nursery schools and the unskilled and ill-trained teachers of day nurseries, Head Start personnel received considerable training through successful in-service efforts (Almy, 1975).

Edith M. Dowley's words, "The history of early childhood education is a history of social change," (Dowley, 1971, p. 12) surely ring true in the development of this field. Impinging social forces have led to the increasing amalgamation of the day nursery, kindergarten, and the nursery school. The combined impact of Head Start and the Women's Liberation Movement, urging women to seek out-of-home careers (Blum, 1983), produced a period of rapid growth of programs for young children (Robinson et al., 1979; Hess & Croft, 1972). Day care centers flourished and nursery school programs expanded to include religious sponsors (Blum, 1983). Some nursery schools extended their programs to meet full day needs of parents (Greenman & Fuqua, 1984). Public school kindergarten programs for five year olds increased particularly in the southern states. In time, local school districts provided programs for 95% of all 5 year olds (Goodlad, 1984). Because of this situation, Head Start monies, originally intended for programs for five year

olds, became available to develop similar programs for three and four year old children (Hildebrand, 1984).

In summary, it was not until the beginning of the nineteenth century that the education of very young children, or early childhood education as distinct from primary and secondary educational levels, began to be thought of as a distinct form of education (McCarthy & Houston, 1980). Historically, child care workers have taken on the roles and responsibilities associated with the particular type of child care program they were employed in. Perhaps nowhere does the dissonance produced by the amalgamation of these traditions emerge as clearly as in discussions of the child care practitioner. By looking back into history we can identify the sources of the diverse ideas, controversies, and practices which have primarily resulted in the pervasive lack of training and education of early childhood teachers.

Historical Development of Teacher Education for Early Childhood Teachers

As mentioned in the previous section, the history of the training of teachers is intimately connected to the development of the field of early childhood education itself. Various pioneers in the field were responsible for implementing teacher training programs which promoted their respective philosophical ideologies. A New England educator, Elizabeth Peabody, became enchanted with the Froebel kindergarten and, after opening the first English-speaking kindergarten in Boston in 1860, helped organize the first

teacher training center for kindergarten teachers (Weber, 1969). A few German immigrants such as Emma Marwedel and Maria Kraus-Boelte, who had studied with Froebel, taught some of the earliest kindergarten training courses (Maksym, 1985). Maria Kraus-Boelte and her husband, John Kraus, together established The New York Seminary for Kindergarteners in which many of the early leaders were to receive their initial training (Snyder, 1972). In 1868 a training school for kindergarten teachers was organized by Matilde Kiege and her daughter (Simmons, Whitfield, & Layton, 1980; Snyder, 1972). "The training given emphasized the kindergarten as a unique form of education apart from and having nothing in common with the [public] school" (Holmes, 1937, p. 270).

As kindergartens became more popular, both charity associations and experienced individuals opened schools for prospective teachers (Ross, 1976). The kindergarten training schools were continued as private, self-supporting institutions, because the normal schools were not able to supply the increasing demand for trained teachers.

Nonetheless, in 1874 the establishment of a kindergarten and kindergarten training department at New York City College (later called Hunter College) came as a result of a series of successful lectures on the kindergarten given to the faculty of the College by Elizabeth Peabody (Snyder, 1972).

Early kindergarten teacher training followed an apprenticeship model. The first kindergarten teachers, out of necessity, were trained using a practical approach. The time for theoretical training was limited, as students were needed for practical work in

kindergartens. Froebelian philosophy and principles were the basis of early kindergarten teacher training. The belief in Froebelian philosophy was evidenced in the attitudes of pioneers. It seemed as though neither sentimental concern for children nor practical teaching experience equipped one to conduct a kindergarten without a thorough knowledge of Froebelian principles (Ross, 1976). Kindergartens and kindergarten teacher training, the foundation for a new system of education during the 1800s, and the comprehensiveness of Froebelian philosophy stood out in striking contrast to the meagerness of the educational theory which preceded it.

While many received very specialized training in Froebelian methodology, the training was simplistically viewed as providing one with a vocation that purportedly would not subvert maternal instincts. Kindergarten training was accepted because it was likely to help women become knowledgeable as well as loving mothers (Ross, 1976). Interestingly, Froebel's first teachers were men--women were admitted to the profession after Froebel married (Spodek, 1978).

As kindergarten became more acceptable and prevalent, the number of specialized training schools increased and a few well-known normal schools introduced instruction in kindergarten training. Early kindergarten teachers were assigned to actual work in the kindergarten from the time they entered the classes. This necessitated placing the emphasis on the technical aspects of the course the mother plays, gifts and occupations, in a half-day session (Vandewalker, 1908). As kindergarten training schools

grew, instruction in other subjects such as music and art was added. Later, subjects in nature study, physical culture, and story-telling were introduced and then courses in psychology, literature, and other subjects became part of the curriculum. The establishment of kindergarten training departments in normal schools and other institutions opened up a whole series of questions concerning the organization of kindergarten training. From the standpoint of pedagogical principle, the apprentice form of training which had been the status quo prior to the establishment of kindergarten training departments in normal schools received much criticism (Vandewalker, 1908).

The late 1800s saw the organization of kindergarten departments in state and city normal schools. Notable among these in the decade between 1880 and 1890 were the state normal schools at Oshkosh, Wisconsin; Winona, Minnesota; Oswego and Fredonia, New York, Emporia, Kansas; and normal schools in Connecticut and Michigan (Vandewalker, 1908). Into the early 1900s, the training received by teachers typically took place in teachers' colleges (such as Columbia Teachers College) and offered curriculum methods and educational philosophy, while the home economics group emphasized child development and family life.

Between 1906 and 1920, the number of kindergarten departments in normal schools and colleges grew from 54 to 109, while a number of teacher training institutions combined kindergarten and primary school preparation into a single course of study (Weber, 1969). By the end of the 1920s, a common curriculum for nursery-kindergarten-first grade had evolved, with an increasing number of teacher

training institutions offering a common preschool-primary school course of study (Weber, 1969).

Meanwhile, in the midst of all this progress the early leaders found themselves challenged in their most cherished beliefs, for the very foundations on which they had so patiently and fervently built were assailed. While previous methods for working with young children had centered around Froebelian philosophy, the newer trends espoused by G. Stanley Hall, William Burnham, John Dewey, and others were now being studied by kindergarten and primary teachers in university classes. The "new psychology" not only gave a more fundamental insight into the nature of the educational process, but it dignified education and placed it upon a scientific basis. Hall and his disciples aimed to acquaint the public, particularly parents and teachers, with the fundamental facts of child development by means of personal observation on their part of the children with whom they came into contact and to lead them to see the nature of an education based upon such facts. They sought to secure the cooperation of parents and teachers in collecting adequate data concerning significant aspects of child growth and, by the shifting and organizing of the data thus obtained, they hoped to obtain a body of principles upon which to base a true educational theory.

The topics selected for observation and study covered a wide range. The growth of a child's body at different periods as shown by weights and measurements received considerable attention. Because of the new psychology in the child's native impulses and instincts, and by motor activities in general, children's plays and

games, their toys and play material, formed one of the most interesting lines of work. The content of children's minds, their use of language, their interests and ideals, and their moral and religious conceptions at different ages received special attention and were taken up for observation and study. The child study work thus carried the spirit and method of the new psychology to many families and up-to-date schoolrooms. In normal schools, child study became the avenue of approach to the study of psychology and pedagogy. In universities, child study became a recognized phase of work in psychology (Vandewalker, 1908).

Although progressive education in its original form did not survive much past the mid-1900s, its influence made marked changes in kindergarten education and teacher training. John Dewey first came into kindergartens to study their practices and help in their reconstruction. His pragmatic philosophy, embodying the best in psychology and sociology of the day, called for a careful study of the child and a patient overhauling of every detail in curriculum and method. His emphasis upon interest in relation to effort, morality as involving choices, the principles of democracy in school organization, and thinking as conditioned in problematic situations when applied in kindergarten education necessarily led to a new curriculum and new methods of teaching and social organization. No one has contributed to the reconstruciton of kindergarten with the impetus of Dewey, not only through his theories of life and education as a part of life, but through his interest in and cooperation with those seriously attempting its reconstruction (Hill, 1925).

Another force affecting young children and the training of teachers in the United States during the early 1900s was the establishment of nursery schools: although kindergartens gained popularity in the late nineteenth century, nursery schools for children under five did not appear until this century in the United States. The first nursery school--a Montessori school-- was opened in 1915 by Eva McLin. In 1922 Edna Noble White opened a nursery school with a training function (McCarthy & Houston, 1980). That is, university credit could be obtained through work and study in her school. The purpose was to train young women in child care as it related to careers in teaching and social work and/or as preparation for motherhood.

During the depression years, a move was made by the Work Projects Administration to employ unemployed teachers. Almost any unemployed educated person was encouraged to become an early childhood teacher and few, if any, had had preparation for teaching children under the age of five. There was a concern among early childhood educators that the standards of the early childhood movement would lower from its former level. The National Association for the Education of Young Children, combining force with the Association for Childhood Education, previously known as the International Kindergarten Union, and the National Council on Parent Education took an active role in supervising the new personnel. Forming an advisory committee, this group assisted in developing guides, records, studies, and field services. Training sessions were started and effort was expended in reaching many rural parts of the country. The greatest impact of this project

was the popularization of the nursery school movement (Braun & Edwards, 1972).

Meanwhile, the existence of the WPA nursery schools and the need for more advanced training gave impetus to the development of college programs focused on child development and preschool education. Some of these graduates moved into positions as teachers in philanthropic day nurseries. These nurseries still served the children of working mothers, but the experience of the children changed drastically as educational programs were introduced.

The advent of World War II necessitated that arrangements be made for the care of young children. Many centers were opened and staffed by professionals as well as volunteers. Essential needs such as food, rest, shelter, and a substitute mother figure were the immediate concern. Occasionally the centers were well equipped, but more often than not, staffs operated with the minimum, including minimal skills (Braun & Edwards, 1972).

Head Start and the emphasis on preschool education in the sixties again challenged the autonomous traditions of the nursery school and day nursery. While such programs were exclusively a service for poor children, emphasis was placed on education as well as socialization. Child care, however, was and remains a secondary function of these largely part-day programs. Nursery school teachers swelled the early Head Start payrolls, to be joined by community members and parents who received on the job training through Head Start (Evans, 1975; Hymes, 1975).

This historical discussion has lead up to the present day

state of affairs with regard to the training and education of early childhood teachers. The final two sections complete the picture on training and education in relation to how the diversity of early childhood programs in the past has affected present day problems in the field. These sections address credentialing and certification as well as qualifications and roles of early childhood teachers related to training and education.

Credentialing and Certification of Early Childhood Teachers

Two areas are addressed here separately: credentialing by educational institutions and federal/state certification requirements.

Credentialing by Educational Institutions

The routes to becoming an early childhood teacher reflect the same diverse components of child care's historical legacy. Depending on the function of the particular type of service, different ideas about preparing practitioners prevail. Credentialing of child care workers varies considerably from state to state. Some merely require a child care teacher to be sixteen or eighteen years old with no previous criminal record. Informal female socialization is thought to provide adequate training for the work. For those states who view the work as skilled and who assume an educational component in the service, a more formal route involving specific educational preparation is required. In some states, Bachelor's degrees in early childhood education, child development, or home economics are sometimes required for head

teachers in public and private child care centers, preschools, and nursery schools. More recently, Associate of Arts degrees (two-year college certificates) in early childhood-related fields have gained widespread acceptance as qualifications for teaching in child care settings. Lying between the more formal educational route and the informal path is a third mode, the Child Development Associate (CDA) credential.

Thus, clearly identifiable early childhood personnel preparation programs exist for teachers and caregivers at three academic levels that parallel the vertical hierarchy of current employment possibilities, though the requirements for such positions vary from state to state (Hollick, Peters, & Kirchner, 1972). The three levels are as follows: (a) nondegree and certificate programs for teachers, day care center aides, ancillary personnel, day care home providers, and the like; (b) two-year Associate degree programs for play group supervisors, classroom aides, and in some states, day care center teachers; and (c) baccalaureate programs for the preparation of teachers and specialists.

Two points about differences among preparation programs need to be raised here: the distinctions between (a) education versus skill training content and (b) child-related training and education versus a liberal arts education.

The first distinction refers to a long-standing controversy over the virtues of "training" versus "educating" teachers and other personnel (Peters & Kostelnik, 1981). Training is sometimes conceived of as requiring little initiative, creativity, or

spontaneity of the trainee while education stresses more self-directed activity. As a corollary of this distinction, training is more often concerned with motor activities and skill and with the acquisition of mental operations which have few and simple alternatives. Education, on the other hand, frequently refers to more sophisticated and rigorous intellectual abilities and learning without exposure to motor activities and skill.

Some personnel preparation programs direct their primary attention to training specific employment-related skills (e.g., those required to be a "change agent," for acquiring new knowledge and for classroom management). The relative emphasis is, in part, related to the academic or professional level of training (Almy, 1975). "The term 'train' implies concentration on the particular skills needed to fit a person for a specified role...Like many other aspects of early childhood education, training for it is complicated by the number and diversity of programs and also by the different traditions related to the provision of care and the provision of education" (Almy, 1975, p. 196). Indeed, there are those who believe that formal academic preparation is unnecessary and irrelevant and that effective teaching behaviors which will generalize across children, time, and settings can be defined and then directly and efficiently trained for preservice or inservice personnel (Granger & Gleason, 1981; Jones & Hamby, 1981; Thomson, Holmberg, & Baer, 1978; Ward, 1976; Williams & Ryan, 1976).

Other programs, however, seek to provide a broad-based educational experience including, for example, aspects of liberal education, knowledge of child development, theoretical, social, and

cultural foundations of educational practice and the like. The underlying belief here is that the effectiveness of any such practical training is heavily dependent on the caregiver's breadth of knowledge, cognitive sophistication, and internalization of child-oriented values and beliefs. From this point of view, practical experiences are effective only in the context of a broadbased formal educational program which serves as the necessary foundation for pragmatic endeavors (Berk & Berson, 1981; Berson & Sherman, 1976).

Still others have argued for the importance of formal educational preparation within accredited college and university programs not so much for the direct consequences they might have on teacher or caregiver job performance, but because of the effects it would have on the professionalization and status of child care workers (Austin, 1981; Berk & Berson, 1981). Despite such arguments for the importance of formal education, advocates of the more pragmatic "training" approaches refer to their greater efficiency and economy. In addition, contradictory conclusions in the research literature on caregiver preparation create uncertainty as to whether broad, formal preservice educational requirements make a real difference in assuring the quality of child care.

A second distinction relates to the value of receiving child-related training and education versus a liberal arts education for early childhood teachers. Child-related training/education refers to specialized preparation relevant to young children, obtained either within a formal degree program or in a training program unrelated to any degree (Benelli, 1984). It could involve either

preservice and/or inservice and formal and/or informal experiences, the content of which can be directly applied to teaching and children. Relevant areas of study might include knowledge of child development, teaching methods courses, early childhood education, elementary education, or special education. This specialized training and/or education might be obtained by early childhood teachers who have no previous knowledge in this area and are at the entry level or as part of a CDA program, an A.A./A.S degree, or a B.A./B.S. degree.

A liberal arts education, on the other hand, refers to a broad range of knowledge in many subject areas not related to practical concerns at the undergraduate level. While such a broad knowledge base is a useful background for a well-rounded early childhood teacher who is frequently expected to develop activities in a variety of curriculum areas, it is debatable whether specific knowledge in the areas of teaching and children can be replaced solely by exposure to a liberal arts education.

The primary distinction which can be raised here is whether it is more effective and useful to be trained in a specialty area (to acquire depth in the knowledge base) or to attain a knowledge base which has breadth: the difference is between the value of vertical or horizontal knowledge bases.

Having put into context these two points, it is now possible to proceed with the original line of discussion which summarizes the current state of affairs with regard to existing certification requirements for early childhood teachers.

Federal/State Regulations and Certification Requirements

One would logically assume that, as the teacher is the acknowledged key to quality care, the qualifications of teachers and caregivers would be clearly specified and stringent. Further, given the number of hours per day caregivers spend with children and the many roles and responsibilities they must assume, one would expect a high level of preparation would be thought necessary by the regulatory agencies responsible for them.

Such expectations are predicated upon certain notions concerning the use of entry controls into a profession for the protection of the client of the service. In addition, teachers are expected to have acquired a base of knowledge related to prior training and current teaching experiences. There is also a prevailing belief that training methods exist that can provide the desired qualifications.

At this time in most of the nation, no unified system of governance exists for regulating the certification of personnel working with young children. Currently, there are no federal regulations governing the qualifications of day care personnel. Within the Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements (FIDCR), entry level qualifications for day care personnel are scattered and vague (FIDCR, 1978). In 1980, a new set of FIDCR regulations for child care was approved supplanting those in force since 1968. The 1968 regulations established vague qualifications for caregivers, stating that "educational activities must be under the supervision and direction of a staff member trained or experienced in child growth and development," "the person providing direct care for children in the facility must have training or demonstrated ability

in working with children" (Department of Health, Education, & Welfare, 1976, p. 9-10). The nature and extent of the training, the kind or amount of experience, and the criteria for demonstrating ability are not spelled out.

No entry level qualifications are included in the 1980 FIDCR regulations. Caregivers without previous experience or training are required to have an on-site orientation on how to care for children in groups before assuming any caregiving responsibilities. In addition, caregivers without nationally recognized child development credentials are required to participate regularly in specialized inservice training related to child care. A plan for such training is to be established and implemented by state day care agencies (Department of Health, Education, & Welfare, 1980).

Current regulations place certification in the hands of a variety of state agencies and institutions. Actual training is accomplished in a widely diverse assortment of settings (including job sites at child care settings, community colleges, colleges, and universities), each following the rough guidelines of one or more agencies and elaborating on those guidelines according to their own inclinations. The state agency jurisdiction is, to some degree, determined by whether or not the services provided are construed as primarily instructional or primarily custodial in nature. The standards vary from state to state, from agency to agency, from facility to facility, and from one educational institution to another. Classification of early childhood personnel, and the labels provided for them, also differ widely.

Studies of the requirements imposed by states indicate that state government is frequently no more specific in terms of staff qualifications than is the federal government (Hollick et al., 1972). One recent report by Johnson and Associates (1982) of selected state licensing requirements for teachers of four year old children indicates the following: among the fifty states, only ten states and the District of Columbia specified a B.A./B.S. degree as a requirement to teach in a child care center. Of these, only three specified that the degree must include a specialization in early childhood education or child development. In addition, twenty-six states and the District of Columbia required the CDA credential. An additional seven states had the CDA requirement in their draft regulations.

The entry level educational requirements of most states specify either general course/credit-hour requirements in child development and child care or graduation from an "approved" degree program. It has been argued that such requirements are inadequate because of their vague and inequitable nature (Peters, Cohen, & McNichol, 1974). Yet, certification based upon preservice course work continues to have strong advocates (Graham & Persky, 1977; Raisner, 1977).

What is not clear is whether skill training and intensive practica are effective only in the context of a formal, preservice education program. Planned variation studies within Follow Through (Soar & Soar, 1972; Stallings, 1975) and efforts at dissemination of programs within the First Chance Network of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped would seem to indicate that such

training is effective in inservice settings. Indeed, the major focal point of training in programs funded by the federal government (such as WPA, Lanham, and Head Start) has been on providing training to individuals as they worked. The vast majority of Head Start teachers have been trained on the job. Several thousand have received training through college courses leading to A.A./A.S or B.A./B.S. degrees. Current Head Start policy is directed toward having every teacher hold either a B.A./B.S. degree in early childhood education or the Child Development Associate (CDA) credential (Trickett, 1979). This credential is based on individualized, flexible, competency-based training emphasizing field work and is usually undertaken as an inservice experience.

In summary, the variety of possible routes for credentialling by educational institutions as well as the lack of definitive federal and state regulations and certification requirements makes for a wide diversity of paths of preparation among early childhood teachers. According to the available literature, the respective value of (a) education versus skill training content, (b) child-related training and education versus a liberal arts education, and (c) preservice versus inservice education remains debatable.

Qualifications and Roles of Early Childhood Teachers Related to Training and Education

The quality of the teachers employed in programs for young children presents a dilemma which has emerged from primarily two forces: the diversity of early childhood programs rooted in its

history as discussed above, and problems relating to defining the qualifications and roles of the teachers in these diverse programs. As pointed out earlier in the section which put into historical perspective the training and education of early childhood teachers, day care, nursery school, and kindergarten programs have merged over time, causing the distinctions among each to blend. In turn, each program employed a diverse range of personnel to meet specific goals. As the programs consolidated, however, the distinctions between staffs remained (Phillips & Whitebook, 1986). Specific indicators of qualified staff have been hampered by a lack of general agreement on the role of the early childhood teacher (Pettygrove & Greenman, 1984; Spodek & Saracho, 1982). Much role confusion exists (Leatzow, Neuhauser, & Wilmes, 1983; Yardley, 1973; Katz, 1970) not only due to the program mergings, but also due to unclear perspectives of what that role encompasses.

Historically, three roles emerged based on programmatic concerns: the caregiver as depicted in day nurseries (or day care centers as they were later called), the paraprofessional from the federally subsidized programs, and the nursery school teacher. It is only the nursery school teacher's role, however, that has changed and contributed to the current confusion.

The role of the nursery school teacher has altered throughout time, reflecting the prevailing theories and philosophies of the day. Recalling that American nursery schools were established on college and university campuses for research purposes, the teacher's role in the 1920s focused more on providing experiential learning and less on direct instruction (Millichamp, 1974).

Gesell's work in the 1930s introduced a new aspect to the role: providing for children's social and emotional growth (Millichamp, 1974). By the 1950s, the teacher became responsible for providing meaningful interpersonal relationships with and for children. Much criticism was directed at that time at the separation of mothers from young children (primarily infants and toddlers). The general viewpoint focused on the fact that such early separations might hinder the growth of trust and security needed for healthy development (Millichamp, 1974). Piaget's work led the way for additional demands placed upon the nursery teacher: facilitating cognitive development (Millichamp, 1974). By the 1970s, teaching roles were diverse. This diversity continues to the present. Thus, not only was there a merging of preschool programs, but also of early childhood staff roles.

No longer were roles clearly distinguishable (Spodek, 1982b; Alberta Department of Education, 1976): kindergarten teachers nurtured and performed caregiving tasks, day care workers taught lessons (Jones, 1984; Millichamp, 1974). Egertson (1980) found that both day care and preschool personnel are quite similar in their orientation towards their role, despite differences among them in age, experiences, education and training, and parental status. Additionally, Phillips and Whitebook (1986) have discovered that caregivers and teachers of young children are basically equivalent in their actual roles in the classroom, but in self-descriptions they are quite different.

To compound the issue further, conventional early childhood vernacular attaches the label of teacher (Spodek, 1982b; Endsley &

Bradbard, 1981) to those employees who are directly responsible for the care of young children either in a caregiving or educating capacity (Alberta Department of Educaiton, 1976). This may be quite appropriate when teaching is defined as the achievement of objectives (Streets, 1982) through either guidance and/or instruction. However, this can be extremely misleading to the consumer who associates teachers with educational programs (Endsley & Bradbard, 1981) and caregivers with nurturance (Spodek, 1982b), possessing surrogate parental skills (Yardley, 1973). Furthermore, the general public parallels day care workers with unskilled laborers (Blum, 1983; Gould, 1981). President Reagan reinforced this opinion when he refuted the necessity of setting standards for child care teachers, because he claimed they are in essence doing what women have done throughout history: taking care of children (Whitebook, 1984; Blum, 1983). This implies that a natural set of skills exists in all women on which standards of quality can not be applied.

Adding to the public's perception of day care is inconsistency in the way early childhood personnel describe themselves (Phillips & Whitebook, 1986) and a tendency to present themselves as professionals possessing specialized training and experience ("Results of NAEYC Survey," 1984). In fact, a self-rating study revealed that early childhood teachers tended to describe their own roles as confusing and vague (Edmon, 1968).

The delineation of qualities attributed to good teachers of young children is difficult. Even though there seems to be general agreement that the teacher's role in early childhood is complex, a

consensus on which role function is most critical is more difficult to locate in the literature (Feeney & Chun, 1985). One of the interrelated problems is the fact that role descriptions for preschool teachers are rare (with the exception of role descriptions which can be found in materials for the Child Development Associate [CDA]). Thus, teachers' responsibilities vary according to the specific program and assignment within that program (Feeney & Chun, 1985). As such, a teacher's duties in a classroom of three year olds in one preschool program may vary greatly from a teacher with the same age group in another program. Additionally, the lack of clear distinctions between the manner in which one teaches (i.e., the teaching style) and the methods employed to do so (i.e., the teaching technique) make it difficult to identify teacher attributes (Kohut, 1980). The lack of role clarity hinders attempts to identify desirable characteristics of good early childhood teachers.

Early childhood specialists have several viewpoints as to which qualities and characteristics should be emphasized for teachers. The first maintains that only characteristics such as education, training, and experience should be indices of teacher qualifications (Watson, 1984; Collins, 1983; Ruopp et al., 1979; Youngblood, 1979). The emphasis on education and training was put into perspective by the National Day Care Study (Ruopp et al., 1979). The results of this research downplayed the importance of general education as an indicator of qualified staff and reported that specialized training was the key predictor of good teachers. Due to low wages, high turnover rates, and lack of data with

respect to the effectiveness of specific in-service programs, the effort to measure quality personnel based solely on training has met resistance (Katz, 1984; Whitebook, 1984). Extracting features prevalent in the teacher effectiveness literature offers little aid. Primarily the research on school effectiveness has focused on elementary and secondary levels and has not been applied to preschool settings (Brophy & Good, 1986; Feeney & Chun, 1985).

The second viewpoint emphasizes the personal attributes of the teacher such as maturity, warmth, flexibility, right- brainedness, and dependability (Pettygrove & Greenman, 1984; Snow, 1983; Benson & Goodman, 1981; Sprung, 1978; Van der Eyken, 1977; Cass, 1975; Klein, 1973; Rosen, 1972; Katz, 1970; Edmon, 1968; Harvey, Prather, White, Alter, & Hoffmeister, 1966).

A third viewpoint unites both the first and second viewpoints; that is, the characteristics related to education, training, and experience with the personal attributes (Brophy & Good, 1986; Feeney & Chun, 1985; "NAEYC's Draft," 1985; Hildebrand, 1984; Leeper, Witherspoon, & Day, 1984; Whitebook, 1984; Leatzow et al., 1983; Mitchell, 1979; Croft, 1976; Steinfels, 1973; Yardley, 1973; Edmon, 1968). Almy (1975) called for professionals well versed in both the practical and theoretical aspects of early childhood education. Edmon (1968) suggested setting high levels of proficiency in "intellectual, physical, moral, and spiritual qualities" (p. 15). Rahmlow & Kiehn (1967) proposed a model which maintains that a variety of kinds of knowledge (i.e., knowledge of child development, knowledge of skills in use of materials, knowledge of physical arrangements, and general knowledge) and the

development of personal characteristics are needed to function well in an early childhood program. Clearly, a common set of criteria for quality of teachers is needed (Phillips & Whitebook, 1986; "Results of NAEYC Survey," 1984; Alberta Department of Education, 1976) if teachers are to be the key component of a quality child care experience.

In summary, the previous discussion has put into perspective the historical development of the training and education of early childhood teachers, the historical development of teacher education, credentialling and certification, and the qualifications and roles as they relate to training and education.

REFERENCES

Alberta Department of Education. (1976). Summary of the early childhood services task force on teacher competence. Edmonton, Alberta: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 141 294)

Almy, M.C. (1975). The early childhood educator at work. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Austin, D. (1981). Formal educational preparation: The structural prerequisite to the professional status of the child care worker. Child Care Quarterly, 10, 250-260.

Benelli, C. (1984). A comparison of profit and nonprofit day care centers in Pennsylvania. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, State College, PA.

Benson, A., & Goodman, D.T. (1981). Child care - Vol. 1. Vocational home economic education. Stillwater, OK: Oklahoma State Board of Vocational and Technical Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 212 840)

Berk, L.E., & Berson, M.P. (1981). A review of the Child Development Associate credential. Child Care Quarterly, 10, 9-42.

Berson, M., & Sherman, C. (1976). Divergent views on prekindergarten teacher education. Educational Leadership, 34, 143-149.

Blum, M. (1983). The daycare dilemma: Women and children first. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.

Braun, S.J., & Edwards, E.P. (1972). History and theory of early childhood education. Belmont,CA: Wadsworth.

Brophy, J., & Good, T.L. (1986). Teacher behavior and student achievement. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (pp. 328-375). New York: MacMillan.

Cass, J.E. (1975). The role of the teacher in the nursery school. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Collins, R. (1983). Child care and the states: The comparative licensing study. Young Children, 38(5), 3-11.

Croft, D.J. (1976). Be honest with yourself: A self-evaluation handbook for ECETS. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. (1980). HEW day care regulations. Federal Register, 45, 17870-17885.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. (1976). Federal interagency day care requirements. Washington, DC: Office of Human Development.

Dowley, E.M. (1971). Perspectives on early childhood education. In R.H. Anderson & H.G. Shane (Eds.), As the twig is bent. (pp. 12-21). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Edmon, M.L. (1968). A self-image of primary school teachers. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.

Egertson, H.A. (1980). A description of the preparation, experience, and educational orientation of teachers in prekindergarten programs in Nebraska. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 204 006)

Endsley, R.C., & Bradbard, M.R. (1981). Quality day Care: A handbook of choices for parents and caregivers. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Evans, E. (1975). Contemporary influences in early childhood education. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements (FIDCR): Report of findings and recommendations. (1978). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation.

Feeney, S., & Chun, R. (1985). Effective teachers of young children. Young Children, 41(1), 47-52.

Goodlad, J.I. (1984). A place called school: Prospects for the future. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gould, N.P. (1981). Women caregivers in licensed day care centers: Who are they? A study. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 224 594)

Graham, L., & Persky, B. (1977). Who should work with young children. In B. Persky & L. Golubchick (Eds.), Early childhood education (pp. 335-337). Wayne, NJ: Avery Publishing.

Granger, R., & Gleason, D. (1981). A review of the Child Development Associate credential: Corrections and comments. Child Care Quarterly, 10, 63-73.

Greenman, J.T., & Fuqua, R.W. (Eds.). (1984). Making day care better: Training, evaluation and the process of change. New York: Teachers College Press.

Harvey, O.J., Prather, M.S., White, B.J., Alter, R.D., & Hoffmeister, J.K. (1966). Teachers' belief systems and preschool atmospheres. Journal of Educational Psychology, 57(6), 373-381.

Hess, R.D., & Croft, D. J. (1972). Teachers of young children. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Hildebrand, V. (1984). Management of child development centers. New York: MacMillan.

Hill, P.S. (1925). Changes in curricula and method in kindergarten education. Childhood Education, 2, 99-107.

Hollick, R., Peters, D.L., & Kirchner, E. (1972). A review of federal and state regulations for day care programs and facilities (Report No. 10). University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Center for Human Services Department.

Holmes, M.C. (1937). The kindergarten in America: Pioneer period. Childhood Education, 13, 269-273.

Hymes, J.L. (1977). Early childhood education: An introduction to the profession (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Hymes, J.L. (1975). Early childhood education: An introduction to the profession. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Joffe, C. (1977). Friendly intruders: Childcare professional and family life. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Johnson, L., & Associates (1982). Comparative licensing study: Profiles of state day care licensing requirements. Washington, DC: Office of Program Development, Office of Developmental Services, Administration for Children, Youth, and Families, Office of Human Development Services, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Jones, E. (1984). Training individuals in the classroom and out. In G.T. Greenman & R.W. Fuqua (Eds.), Making day care better: Training, evaluation, and the process of change (pp. 185-201). New York: Teachers College Press.

Jones, L., & Hamby, T. (1981). Comments on 'A review of the Child Development Associate credential.' Child Care Quarterly, 10, 74-83.

Katz, L.G. (1984). The education of preprimary teachers. In L.G. Katz (Ed.), Current topics in early childhood education

(Vol. 5). (pp. 209-227). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Katz, L.G. (1970, March). Sentimentality in preschool teachers: Some possible interpretations. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, Minneapolis, MN. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 035 792)

Klein, J.W. (1973). Making it or breaking it: The teacher's role in model (curriculum) implementation. Young Children, 29, 359-366.

Kohut, S., Jr. (1980). Research and the teacher: Teacher effectiveness in early childhood education. In D.G. Range, J.R. Layton, & D.L. Roubinek (Eds.), Aspects of early childhood education: Theory to research to practice (pp.143-179). New York: Academic.

Leatzow, N., Neuhauser, C., & Wilmes, L. (1983). Creating discipline in the early childhood classroom. Provo, UT: Brigham Young University.

Leeper, S.H., & Witherspoon, R.L. (1984). Good schools for young children (5th ed.). New York: MacMillan.

Maksym, J.H. (1985). Selected Indiana and Michigan kindergarten teachers' perceptions of their needed professional preparations and desired competencies. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI.

McCarthy, M.A., & Houston, J.P. (1980). Fundamentals of early childhood education. Cambridge, MA: Winthrop Publishers.

Millichamp, D.A. (1974). Preschool teaching - An historical perspective. In M.I. Fletcher (Ed.), The adult and the nursery school child (pp.7-19). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Mitchell, G. (1979). The day care book: A guide for working parents to help them find the best possible day care for their children. New York: Stein & Day.

National Association for the Education of Young Children. (1985). NAEYC's draft position statement on developmentally appropriate practice in early childhood programs. Washington, DC: Author.

Peters, D.L., Cohen, A., & McNichol, M. (1974). The training and certification of early childhood personnel. Child Care Quarterly, 3(1), 39-53.

Peters, D.L., & Kostelnik, M.J. (1981). Current research in day

care personnel preparation. In S. Kilmer (Ed.), Advances in early education and day care (Vol. 2.) (pp. 29-60). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Pettygrove, W.B., & Greenman, J.T. (1984). The adult world of day care. In J.T. Greenman and R.W. Fuqua (Eds.), Making day care better: Training, evaluation, and the process of change (pp.84-105). New York: Teachers College Press.

Phillips, D., & Whitebook, M. (1986). Who are child care workers? The search for answers. Young Children, 41(4), 14-20.

Rahmlow, H.F., & Kiehn, S.O. (1967). A survey and analysis of major tasks, knowledges associated with work in child care occupations. (Washington State University Formal Report, Project #7-0031). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. E
021 066)

Raisner, A. (1977). Professionalism and teacher education. In B
Persky & L. Golubchick (Eds.), Early childhood education (pp. 334). Wayne, NJ: Avery Publishing.

Results of the NAEYC survey of child care salaries and working conditions. (1984) Young Children, 40(1), 9-14.

Robinson, N.M., Robinson, H.B., Darling, M.A., & Holm, G. (1979). A world of children: Daycare and preschool institutions. Monterey, CA: Brooks Cole.

Rosen, J.L. (1972). Matching teachers with children. The School Review, 80(3), 409-431.

Ross, E.D. (1976). The kindergarten crusade: The establishment of preschool education in the United States. Athens, OH: Ohio University Press.

Ruopp, R., Travers, J., Glantz, F., & Coelen, C. (1979). Children at the center: Summary findings and their implications. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates.

Scarr, S., & Weinberg, R.A. (1986). The early childhood enterprise: Care and education of the young. American Psychologist, 41(10), 1140-1146.

Simmons, B.W., Whitfield, E.L., & Layton, J.R. (1980). The preparation of early childhood teachers: Philosophical and empirical foundations. In D.G. Range, J.R. Layton, & D.L. Roubinek (Eds.), Aspects of early childhood education: Theory to research to practice (1-38). New York: Academic Press.

Snow, C.W. (1983, November). As the twig is bent: A review of

research on the consequences of day care with implications for caregiving. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association for the Education of Young Children, Atlanta, Georgia. North Carolina. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 238 594)

Snyder, A. (1972). Dauntless women in childhood education 1856-1931. Washington, DC: Association for Childhood Education International.

Soar, R., & Soar, R. (1972). An empirical analysis of selected Follow-Through programs: An example of a process approach to evaluation. In I. Gordon (Ed.), Early childhood education - The seventy-first yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. (pp. 223-251). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Spodek, B. (1978). Teaching in the early years. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Spodek, B. (1982a). Early childhood education: A synoptic view. In N. Niv-Janiv, B. Spodek & D. Steg (Eds.), Early childhood education: An international perspective (pp. 1-12). New York: Plenum Press.

Spodek, B. (1982b). The kindergarten: A retrospective and contemporary view. In L. Katz (Ed.), Current topics of early childhood education, Vol. 4 (pp. 61-72). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Spodek, B., & Saracho, O.N. (1982). The preparation and certification of early childhood personnel. In B. Spodek (Ed.), Handbook of research in early childhood education (pp. 399-425). New York: Free Press.

Sprung, B. (1978). Perspectives on non-sexist early childhood education. New York: Teachers College Press.

Sroufe, G.E. (1980). Policy issues related to day care in the United States. In Rubin (Ed.), Critical issues in educational policy: An administrator's overview (pp. 191-209). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Stallings, J. (1975). Implementation and child effects of teaching practices in Follow-Through classrooms. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 40 (7 & 8, Serial No. 163).

Steinfels, M.O. (1973). Who's minding the children? The history and politics of day care in America. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Streets, D.T. (1982). Administering day care and preschool

programs. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Trickett, P.E. (1979). Career development in Head Start. Head Start: A legacy of the War on Poverty. New York: Free Press.

Van der Eyken, W. (1977). The pre-school years. Middlesex, England: Penguin.

Vandewalker, N.C. (1908). The kindergarten in American education. New York: Macmillan.

Ward, E. (1976). The Child Development Associate Consortium's assessment system. Young Children, 31(4), 244-254.

Watson, R. (1984, September). Five steps to good day care. Newsweek, p. 21.

Weber, E. (1969). The kindergarten: Its encounter with educational thought in America. New York: Teachers College Press.

Whitebook, M. (1984). Caring for children as work. In J.T. Greenman & R.W. Fuqua (Eds.), Making day care better: Training, evaluation, and the process of change (pp. 66-83). New York: Teachers College Press.

Whitebook, M. (1976). Formation of character: Conservation in the home: A study of day nurseries in the progressive era. Unpublished master's thesis, University of California, Berkeley, CA.

Williams, C.R., & Ryan, T.F. (1976). Competent professionals for quality child care and early education: The goal of the CDA. Young Children, 31, 244-254.

Yardley, A. (1973). The teacher of young children. New York: Citation Press.

Youngblood, C.E. (1979). Multicultural early childhood education. In A.L. Butler & W. LeVassur (Eds.), Viewpoints in teaching and learning (pp. 37-43). Bloominton, IN: Indiana University, Journal of School of Education, 55(3).

Zigler, E.F., & Gordon, E.W. (Eds.) (1982). Day care: Scientific and social policy issues. Boston: Auburn House.